



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

centration camps in South Africa has been deep and widespread. A good deal of it has, we fear, been much more creditable to the heart than to the head of many of those who have been so deeply moved. The latest revelations of the British Blue Book are indeed ghastly. During October 3,156 of the white prisoners died, of whom 2,633 were children. In November the deaths numbered 2,807, 2,271 being those of children. The total number of deaths of whites in the camps during the six months ending with November was just short of 14,000, to say nothing of the blacks. Mr. Brodrick, the British war secretary, in the face of this grewsome record, has had the hardihood to stand up and say that the camp-prison system has been carried through "to the credit of British humanity"! The *Spectator* insists that there has been no evidence of carelessness or indifference on the part of those in charge!! Mr. Hugh Price Hughes, in the *Methodist Times*, gives the government credit for great generosity in relieving the Boer men in the field of the necessity of taking care of their women and children!!! Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman says that "the hypocrisy of these excuses is almost more loathsome than the cruelty itself."

There has never been in the whole history of warfare, these excuses to the contrary notwithstanding, anything more merciless and inhuman than this South African slow murder of women, children and old men in the interest of conquest. But not a *government* has uttered one word of protest. Why? There is not a single country — France, Germany, Russia, Italy, Austria, or any other — whose government, under the same circumstances, would not have done as the British has done. A little while ago our own republic from side to side was cursing Spain to the bottom of perdition for her Weyerism in Cuba. But we are not to-day — at least only comparatively few of our people — condemning Great Britain for the same black art. Our government is indeed doing the same thing, in a somewhat milder form, in one of the Philippine Islands, and would, *with the support of the people*, go to the same length of severity if the resistance to our aggression should prove as hard to conquer as that of the Boers to the British.

A conquering power will never hesitate to kill off by one means or another the entire population of a country and to destroy every farthing's worth of property, if thereby victory can be secured, and in no other way. The Boers would not hesitate to destroy, if possible, the British nation and people forever, if thereby they could win. The present British government, rather than yield, would willingly kill every man, woman, child, horse, ox, sheep, goat, pig and fowl in the two republics. That is the *ultima ratio* of war. Here is confirmatory evidence just over from the Philippines. The *Manila Times*, referring to the plan of campaign in Samar, says:

"The Cavite marines, to the number of three hundred and thirty, are stationed at Balaguinga. These marines, in conjunction with the soldiers of the Eleventh Infantry, will operate from the south, scouring and burning the country northwards, until they meet and join hands with the Twenty-sixth, Twelfth, Seventh and Ninth Regiments. When the southern part of the island is thoroughly cleaned up, operations will begin from Luzon down to the southern line of troops. Samar Island will be made a desert where birds cannot live. It is possible that, awed by the terrible punishments about to be inflicted, Lukban and his followers will decide to throw themselves on the mercy of the Americans, trusting to any terms which may be given them. Lukban's friends have beseeched General Hughes to postpone his measure of retaliation until the rebel chief can be given a chance to present himself to the American forces. These supplicants have received but slight encouragement from General Hughes."

If what is here meant by making a country a desert where birds cannot live is lawful, why not reconcentration with all its tale of horrors? If you may cut off supplies, burn all villages and homes, destroy all crops, and leave people — soldiers, men, women, children — to die if they will not surrender, what is there wrong in shutting them up to die by wholesale in camps in order to force submission? When Mr. Brodrick defends these camps on the ground of military necessity, is he not following consistently the logic of war?

Reconcentration is probably to be one of the settled features of warfare hereafter. Long-range rifles have made it necessary, and all the "rules of civilized warfare" that may be drawn up will not prevent it. A few men armed with Mausers or Krag-Jorgensons can hold almost any number at bay and prevent victory to their enemies, so long as they have a devoted population behind them to harbor and feed them. What has been done by Spain, by Great Britain, and has just been inaugurated by the United States in the Philippines, is sure, therefore, to be one of the settled means of conquest hereafter wherever it is practicable.

All this is perfectly logical if we allow war to go on at all; and those who support the wars will feel themselves obliged to find excuses, however shallow and hypocritical, to justify what their hearts condemn as utterly inhuman and wicked. This fact ought to lead all those who have been so shocked and humiliated at what has been reported from the reconcentration camps to see clearly their duty as to the whole business of war, which is the fruitful root of every kind and degree of evil.

### President Roosevelt's First Message.

President Roosevelt's first message is, on the whole, what might have been expected. It is unconventional, vigorous, unambiguous. It is rather too much like an oration or a lecture, and might well have been reduced one-half and yet have expressed fully and

clearly what he had to say. We notice only the points in it which deal with international relations and the subject of peace.

His reciprocity recommendations are as strong as those of the late President. He wisely urges "a liberal policy in dealing with foreign nations," and the avoidance of "whatever is merely petty and vexatious in the way of trade restrictions." It is very unfortunate that the commercial selfishness of certain classes in the nation is so great and controlling that the President's desire in this direction, in the interest of "cordial relations with other countries," stands little chance of realization at the present time.

What Mr. Roosevelt says about Cuba is above criticism. She must have her independence according to our pledges, and such commercial treatment at our hands as will enable her people at once to begin to realize material prosperity. This means, according to the President's sense of morality, "substantial reduction in the tariff duties on Cuban imports into the United States." This course, which now seems likely to be defeated by the same selfish interests which are opposing reciprocity, is the only possible one consistent with United States truthfulness and honor. The ruin of Cuba now through commercial exclusiveness would be a crime as base as that which Spain was committing against the island.

On the subject of the Philippines, one-half of the President's head is right and the other just as wrong. He repeats, with evident sincerity, the threadbare and groundless assertion that we were forced by the exigencies of the case to take possession of the islands. He draws heavily on his fancy when he affirms that to deliver them to the inhabitants at the present time would be to turn them over to "a welter of murderous anarchy." Since the message has grown cool, General Chaffee's communication that the entire people are solidly and bitterly against our rule ought to have convinced the President of the absolute groundlessness of his assertion that "the insurrection has become an affair of local banditti and marauders." How can a man of Mr. Roosevelt's honesty and habits of inquiry have failed to find out the real facts? His further language about self-government indicates that he is in favor of ultimately giving the Filipinos their independence. For honesty's sake he ought to have said so. Senator Hoar is perfectly right when he declares that if the President had said that, and the government should begin to work on that basis, the resistance would end at once, while otherwise "we shall have open resistance constantly breaking out, and instead of cordial submission the sullen submission of fear to force."

On the subject of international peace, no President, if we remember rightly, has ever taken higher ground than Mr. Roosevelt in this message. "This nation," he says, "most earnestly desires sincere and cordial

friendship with all others." He recognizes fully the movement of civilization toward permanent peace. "Over the entire world, of recent years, wars between the great civilized powers have become less and less frequent." "More and more the civilized peoples are realizing the wicked folly of war, and are attaining that condition of just and intelligent regard for the rights of others which will in the end, as we hope and believe, make world-wide peace possible. The Peace Conference at The Hague gave definite expression to this hope and belief, and marked a stride toward their attainment."

We are sorry indeed that the President has associated with this enlightened and accurate statement the most erroneous opinion that the "wars with barbarous or semi-barbarous peoples come in an entirely different category, being merely a most regrettable but necessary international police duty which must be performed for the sake of the welfare of mankind." The evidence, it seems to us, is overwhelming that there has been almost nothing of the police nature about these wars, but that they have been nearly invariably caused — always primarily caused — by the aggressiveness of the "civilized powers" upon the territories and rights of the native and weaker races. When the civilized powers come to respect these rights, as they are said by the President to respect those of one another, and to use simple common justice and Christian kindness toward such peoples, these wars will cease also.

The bad side of the President's reasoning comes out most fully in his discussion of the navy and army, to which he devotes about one-seventh of the message. The navy — a growing navy — is to him the guiding star of the nation. Without it we can have neither peace nor safety. With it alone can we "beat out the mastery of the seas." Without it "we shall cease to be of 'those who go down to the sea in ships.'" Without it, that is, our merchant ships will be entirely driven off the ocean, and politically we shall have to take a back seat in international affairs. Hence, the President wants our naval guns, in order to keep the blue jackets efficient, to be forever booming away in practice on the seas, even if it wears the ships out.

These are the commonplace arguments which one is accustomed to hear, though they are clothed, in the message, in the fervid Rooseveltian rhetoric. But the President, carried away by his passionate, we had almost said pathetic, love of the navy, seems to have no consciousness of the gigantic perils into which such a policy will lead. He does not see the relentless rivalry in naval development on the part of other powers which it will induce, and the consequent further expansion indefinitely on our part. The leap-ing up of the naval estimates by ten and twenty millions a year, and the immense burdens which will thus be laid on the taxpayers, on industry of every kind, with consequent physical and moral deteriora-

tion, are to him an empty shadow. He considers it all a cheap insurance against dangers which have in reality no existence, unless we create them. He forgets entirely the lessons of history, written in the decline and fall of many kingdoms, when he argues that such an armament will not promote aggressiveness, and thus greatly increase our danger of entanglements and war. It is very shortsighted statesmanship to sacrifice the ultimate weal of a nation, both material and moral, nay, its very life and character, to the present allurements of vulgar prestige and power, which a great, progressive, idealistic people like ours ought to shun as it loves its own life and mission. The President, in this part of his message, has made himself the sponsor and leader of that in the national life which at the present time is most perverted and most to be dreaded.

### The New Hay-Pauncefote Canal Treaty.

The text of the new Hay-Pauncefote canal treaty, which we give on another page, shows that it is a much better treaty than the rumors about it had led us to expect. It is not equal, from our point of view, to the former treaty before it was amended, as that convention provided for the participation of all the maritime powers in the neutralization of the canal if ever built. The reasons which we then gave why all great constructed international waterways as well as natural ones should be under joint neutralization of the nations, will be remembered.

The present treaty differs from the former in formally superseding the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, in omitting all reference to fortifications, and in providing for the neutralization of the canal by the United States alone.

The obligations under which the United States puts herself in assuming alone the neutralization are very strong and wide-reaching. She undertakes to keep the canal "free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations *observing these rules* on terms of entire equality"; that "the canal shall never be blockaded, nor shall any right of war be exercised nor any act of hostility be committed within it," though our government "shall be at liberty to maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder"; that vessels of war of belligerents shall not revictual or take stores in the canal or unnecessarily delay their transit through it; that belligerents "shall not embark or disembark troops, munitions of war, or warlike materials in the canal" except in case of accidental hindrance; and that these provisions shall apply to waters adjacent to the canal within three marine miles of either end, within which waters vessels of war of a belligerent shall not remain longer than twenty-four hours, except in case of distress.

These provisions, if faithfully carried out, will

effectually neutralize the canal forever. The obligations taken by the United States are solemnly assumed in a permanent treaty with Great Britain, who will therefore in this sense always be a party to the neutralization, and will have the right and duty of protesting if any of the provisions should be violated. In a remoter sense, all other nations which shall *observe these rules* will be parties to the neutralization, and will have the moral right to enter complaint in case our government fails to fulfill its promises. Those, therefore, who think that this treaty leaves the United States government at all times free of international restraint in the disposition of the canal are in very serious error.

Even in case of war between the United States and Great Britain, if such a thing were any longer to be thought of, the neutralization of the canal would not be affected, and our government, as a belligerent, would have in the canal no advantages over the British if the provisions as to belligerents were faithfully observed. If they were not, the treaty would, of course, cease to exist.

The provision that "no right of war shall be exercised, nor any act of hostility be committed within it," coupled with the omission of the whole subject of fortifications, makes it very uncertain whether any fortifications could ever be erected along the canal without essential violation of the compact. The liberty of maintaining a military police, in order to protect the canal against lawlessness and disorder, could not be interpreted as giving the right, except under the most extraordinary and improbable circumstances, of erecting and maintaining permanent fortifications.

The value of the treaty as securing the lasting neutrality of the waterway when constructed is much enhanced by the provision that "no change of territorial sovereignty or of international relations of the country or countries traversed by the before-mentioned canal shall affect the general principles of neutralization or the obligations of the high contracting parties under the present treaty." If the United States should ever decide to seize and annex or should obtain by treaty the whole country through which the canal is to pass, she would still, in view of this provision, be under the same obligations to maintain its absolute neutrality.

Opposition to the treaty developed very little strength in the Senate, and it was ratified on the 16th ult. by a vote of seventy-two to six. It is understood that the bill providing for the construction of the canal will be quickly put through Congress, and that the work will be commenced at an early date. Our government is securing a perpetual lease of a strip of territory six miles wide through which the canal is to run.